

REMARKS

In this paper, claim 1 is currently amended. After entry of the above amendment, claims 1-11 are pending.

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Romano (US 5,470,277). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the drive shaft vector points away from the primary motor housing and toward a terminating end of the drive shaft, wherein the drive shaft vector that points toward the terminating end of the drive shaft also points away from the plane containing the second and fourth link pins at a location where the drive shaft exits the primary motor housing.

Romano discloses a power operated gear change assembly for bicycles wherein a stationary body (16) is coupled to a mount portion (22) for a rocker arm (17) through link arms (20, 21). Link arms (20, 21) are pivotably connected to stationary body (16) through pivot pins (25, 26), respectively, and link arms (20, 21) are pivotably connected to mount portion (22) through pivot pins (23, 24), respectively. A motor (27) is diagonally coupled to pivot pins (23) and (26), wherein the motor housing (28) is coupled to pivot pin (26), and the output shaft (29) of motor (27) is coupled to pivot pin (23). Insofar as pivot pins (23, 24) are interpreted to be second and fourth link pins that lie within a plane, and insofar as output shaft (29) defines a drive shaft vector that points away from the motor housing and toward a terminating end of the drive shaft, the drive shaft vector at the location where the drive shaft exits the primary motor housing points *toward* the plane containing the second and fourth link pins. Thus, Romano neither discloses nor suggests the subject matter recited in amended claim 1.

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Romano in view of Fukuda (US 6,162,140). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed as a minimum for the same reasons noted above.

Furthermore, disposing Romano's output shaft (20) entirely within the base member would destroy the operation of the Romano derailleur because Romano's output shaft (20) must reach pivot

pin (23) at mount portion (22) in order to function.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 have been overcome by the foregoing amendment and remarks, and it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Deland
Reg. No. 31,242

DELAND LAW OFFICE
P.O. Box 69
Klamath River, California 96050
(530) 465-2430